

REMARKS

Entry of Amendment

As Applicants are filing a RCE herewith, this amendment, the new claims, and the accompanying IDS should be entered and considered at this time.

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 6-7, 19, 31, 48 and 50-52

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 6-7, 19, 31, 48 and 50-52 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita et al. (WO 98/24271 - English equivalent, US Patent Publication No. 2002/0041926) in view of Iguchi (WO 98/27579 - English equivalent, US Patent Publication No. 2002/0009536) and Kasubuchi et al. (US 3,878,517). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 6 to recite “discharging liquid comprising an organic light-emitting material to a pixel column over a substrate from a nozzle by contacting a contact element attached to the nozzle to a bank so that the contact element and the pixel column are connected through the liquid comprising said organic light-emitting material, wherein the nozzle is provided with the contact element through which the liquid is discharged.”

It is undisputed that neither Miyashita '271 nor Kasubuchi disclose or suggest that the nozzle is provided with the contact element through which the liquid is discharged. The Examiner,

however, has cited Iguchi '579 for allegedly showing a nozzle and a contact element. As explained below, Iguchi '579 does not disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Iguchi '579 appears to disclose a paste applicator 20. This is believed to be the closest thing in Iguchi '579 to a nozzle.¹ The Examiner also seems to be inferring that height sensor 40 corresponds to the contact element. However, in Iguchi '579, as shown in Figs. 3 and 4, the height sensor 40 is provided apart from the paste applicator 20. Hence, even if it is argued that height sensor 40 corresponds to the contact element (which as Applicants explained in their prior responses, Applicants disagree that height sensor 40 is the claimed contact element), height sensor 40 is not in contact with nor is it attached to the nozzle (paste applicator 20).

The Examiner, however, also contends with regard to Iguchi '579 that “[t]aking the apparatus as a whole, the height sensor 40 is indirectly attached to the paste applicator 20, which is in turn attached to the nozzle. Claim 6 does not require a particular connection between the nozzle and the contact element.”

As explained above, Claim 6 now recites that “the nozzle is provided with the contact element through which the liquid is discharged.” Hence, a particular connection is provided in Claim 6 between the nozzle and the contact element, and such a connection is not disclosed or suggested in Iguchi '579 (where the paste applicator 20 is not provided with the height sensor 40). Hence, this claimed feature is not disclosed or suggested in Iguchi '579.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that neither Miyashita '271, Iguchi '579 nor Kasubuchi disclose or suggest that the contact element and the pixel column are connected through the liquid as in Claim 6.

¹ The passages in Iguchi '579 cited by the Examiner refer to applying a phosphor paste which is done

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest the method of independent Claim 6 or those claims dependent thereon. Therefore, these claims are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 26

The Examiner also rejects Claim 26 under 35 USC §103(a) over Miyashita in view of Iguchi, and Kasubuchi and further in view of Kurosawa et al. (US 6,057,647). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Claim 26 is a dependent claim. Accordingly, it is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 6. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 49

The Examiner also rejects Claim 49 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyashita in view of Iguchi and Kasubuchi and further in view of Horike (US 4,281,332). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Claim 49 is a dependent claim. Accordingly, it is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 6. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

in the reference using paste applicator 20.

New Claims

Applicants are also adding new Claims 53-77 herewith. These claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 6. Therefore, as an RCE is being filed herewith, it is respectfully requested that these claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are also submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action for this application.

Applicants are also providing a correction and further information to two 1449 forms already considered by the Examiner in order to correct the file.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in an allowable condition and should be allowed.

Please charge our deposit account 50/1039 for any further fee for this amendment, the new claims, the RCE, and/or the IDS.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: November 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street; Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 26568